

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,961	03/19/2004	Bret M. Lincoln	33280	7880
7590 11/21/2005		EXAMINER		
PEARSON & PEARSON, LLP			AMERSON, LORI BAKER	
GATEWAY CENTER 10 GEORGE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOWELL, MA 01852			3764	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/804,961	LINCOLN, BRET M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	L Amerson	3764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 S	eptember 2005.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,14-18 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,11,12,14-18 and 20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 8-10 and 21-25 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2005 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						

Application/Control Number: 10/804,961 Page 2

Art Unit: 3764

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The indication of allowability to claims 4, 13 and 19 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - a. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrenfried in view of Goodman. The rejection from the previous action is incorporated herein. Regarding the amended limitations, Goodman teaches a hinge support bar 24 and a threaded rod 9 and a crank 18.
 - b. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 11-12, 14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson in view of Chenera. The rejection from the previous action is incorporated herein. Regarding the amended limitations, Chenera teaches a hinge support bar 104, threaded rod 110 and wing support frame 150 attached to the leg section. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Richardson in view of Chenera such that a threaded rod is provided to raise and lower the level of the legs using a crank. The leg section, being padded conforms to the users leg.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/804,961

Art Unit: 3764

- Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over C. Richardson and Chenera in view of Mangini. Richardson and Chenera disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for strap. Mangini teaches a strap. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a strap to support the user.
- Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d. Richardson and Chenera in view of Jensen. Richardson and Chenera disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the rod within a frame. Jensen teaches a threaded rod in figure 3 within a frame (fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enclose the rod within a frame for safety purposes.
- Claims 8-10 and 21-25 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base 3. claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to L Amerson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4971. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri from 9-6 p.m. Interviews Tue. and Thur..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/804,961

Art Unit: 3764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 4

Lori Amerson